

FINAL EIR ERRATA PLACER VINEYARDS SPECIFIC PLAN

1. Letter 34, Chris Hanson, West Placer Waste Management Authority: Mitigation Measure 4.11.5-1b pertaining to fair share payments for expansion of the MRF and landfill is discussed under Response 34C and is modified in the Final EIR with regard to the use of fair share payments. As set forth in the Revised Draft EIR, the last sentence of the mitigation measure referred to fair share mechanisms being described in the “Development Agreement for the Specific Plan”. It has since been determined that growth within the Specific Plan area was included within the projections for landfill operations and additional financial mechanisms are unnecessary at this time, although the project would be subject to any fees adopted in the future. The last sentence of the mitigation measure is therefore removed and clarifying language added as follows:

Projects in the Specific Plan area shall contribute a fair share amount toward expansion of the MRF (including accommodation of a greenwaste program for the Specific Plan area) and landfill to the Western Placer Waste Management Authority. Payment of all applicable established fees in place at the time of issuance of a building permit shall constitute fair share pursuant to this mitigation measure. Expansions to be funded with the fair share payment may ~~also~~ include facilities not located on the site of the landfill such as transfer stations serving the Specific Plan area. ~~A mechanism for ensuring that this fair share payment is implemented shall be described in the Development Agreement for the Specific Plan.~~

This minor change in the manner in which fair share payments are determined has no bearing on the environmental analysis contained in the Final EIR and does not alter any of its conclusions.

2. Letter 29, Mark Morse, Environmental Coordinator, City of Roseville: Response to Comment 29N makes reference to Specific Plan Policy 5.23, pertaining to a bicycle crossing of Baseline Road in the eastern portion of the project area. The subject Specific Plan language has been moved to Specific Plan Policy 5.24 in the current version. This correction to Response to Comment 29N has no bearing on the environmental analysis contained in the Final EIR and does not alter any of its conclusions.
3. Although not reflected in the bound versions of the Final EIR dated October 2006, Mitigation Measures 4.6-1, 4.6-2a, 4.6-2b, 4.6-2c, 4.6-2e, and 4.6-5 have been modified as shown below in response to a November 16, 2006, letter to Michael Johnson from Greg Baker of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria (“UAIC”). The changed language is the product of consultation between Placer County and the UAIC pursuant to Senate Bill 18 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004; Gov. Code, §§ 65352, subd. (a)(9), 65352.3, 65352.4, 65562.5):

4.6-1 *Prior to any ground-disturbing activity within five hundred feet of historical resources and unique archaeological resources, archaeological*

surface inspections shall be completed to determine if each respective site still exists and, if so, archaeological test excavations shall be conducted to the extent necessary to determine if further mitigation is necessary. A representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be invited to participate in such surface inspections and to monitor any excavations determined to be necessary based on the surface inspections. If determined to be necessary, a data recovery plan, which makes provision for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the archaeological resources, shall be prepared by a qualified professional archaeologist and adopted by the County prior to any excavation. Prior to adopting any such plan that addresses disturbance to any Native American cultural place or places, the County shall seek comments on a draft of the plan from a representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria. The data recovery plan shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center. To the extent that the plan includes information pertaining to Native American cultural places, such information shall remain confidential and not be released to the general public.

- 4.6-2a *In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains, until a representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria has been notified and compliance with the provisions of Section 15064.5 (e)(1) and (2) of the CEQA Guidelines has occurred.*
- 4.6-2b *If any artifacts or other indications of cultural resources 45 years old or older are found once ground-disturbing activities are underway, the find shall be immediately evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, and a representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be immediately notified. If the find is determined to be an historical or unique archaeological resource, contingency funding and a time allotment to allow for implementation of avoidance measures or appropriate mitigation shall be made available, as provided in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Work may continue on other parts of the project site while historical or unique archaeological resource mitigation takes place.*
- 4.6-2c *~~Prior to the issuance of any permits for construction, including demolition permits~~ approval of any small lot tentative subdivision map, Design/Site Review application for new construction, or issuance of demolition permits for properties that have not been previously inspected by an archaeologist or previously inspected by an architectural historian, a qualified archaeologist and/or architectural historian, as appropriate, shall be retained to identify and evaluate any cultural resources, and*

determine if further mitigation, may be necessary, and recommend any such potential mitigation to the County for its consideration. A representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be invited to review a draft of any report or findings produced and to offer comments and suggestions regarding how to mitigate impacts to any such native American cultural resources. The County will assess the feasibility of any proposed mitigation (e.g., avoidance of the historical resource) and impose the mitigation where feasible in light of Specific Plan policies and land use assumptions. The necessity of inspection by an architectural historian includes any buildings potentially eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources, but for which the identification and evaluation process (the filling out of Primary, Building and Location record forms distributed by the California Office of Historic Preservation) has not been completed.

4.6-2e An archaeologist and (if available) a representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall participate in the preconstruction meeting(s) to inform the participants of the sensitivity and location of any California Register-eligible sites in the vicinity of grading or construction.

4.6-5 Prior to any ground disturbing or demolition work for intersection improvements, road widenings and utilities construction, an on-the-ground inspection shall be conducted of the areas outside existing public rights-of-way by a qualified archaeologist and/or architectural historian, as appropriate. A representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be invited to participate in such inspections, which will, at a minimum, include a field inspection, the recording on forms distributed by the California Office of Historic Preservation of any cultural resources 45 years old or older, an assessment of eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources and qualification as a "unique archaeological resource," and a technical report that follows California Office of Historic Preservation guidelines for contents and format. In the event that the report addresses impacts to any Native American cultural place or places, a representative of the United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria shall be invited to review a draft of the report and to offer comments and suggestions regarding how to mitigate impacts to any such Native American cultural places. The report shall contain any feasible mitigation measures to be implemented by the applicant. In some cases, an updated records search by the appropriate information center of the California Historical Resources Information System may be necessary if the proposed routes change or if there is more than a year delay between the present study (2005) and said field inspection(s). To the extent that the report includes information pertaining to Native American cultural places,

such information shall remain confidential and not be released to the general public.

Although not the result of any CEQA requirements (in that the Senate Bill 18 consultation process is separate from the CEQA environmental review process), the above changes have the effect of strengthening the mitigation measures as set forth in the Revised Draft EIR by ensuring that the native American community is involved in any future decision-making regarding treatment of cultural resources of interest to the United Auburn Indian Community, consistent with the intent of Senate Bill 18. These minor changes and additions are procedural in nature and have no bearing on the environmental analysis contained in the Final EIR and do not alter any of its conclusions.

4. After publication of the October 2006 Final EIR, five errata were noted in Revised Draft EIR Section 6.3.4 pertaining to the Blueprint Alternative. These errata have no bearing on the analysis performed for the EIR and are minor and typographical in nature. The errata are described below:

Page 6-47 incorrectly reports the conclusion for Impact 4.1-7 as “potentially significant”. As is correctly stated in the fifth paragraph from the top on page 6-46, the conclusion should read “less than significant.”

Page 6-48 reports that impacts associated with the compliance with Standard 8 (Agricultural Water Supply) of the *Dry Creek/West Placer Community Plan* (Impact 4.1-13) are less than significant after mitigation. As is more fully reported on page 4.1-62 of the Revised Draft EIR, although such impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level, such impacts remain significant and unavoidable for CEQA purposes due to the fact the Placer County cannot control the actions of the City of Lincoln, whose cooperation and active participation will be necessary to undertake the physical improvements contemplated as a means of enhancing agricultural water deliveries, as envisioned by Standard 8.

The last sentence of the last paragraph on page 6-53 should read as follows: “This impact is less than significant after mitigation,” rather than “less than significant.” This more complete explanation is provided on page 4.3-30 of the Revised Draft EIR.

The first line of the second and third paragraphs from the top of page 6-115 should refer to “Impact 4.7-22” rather than “Impact 4.7-21”. Although an incorrect impact number is given, the conclusions are correctly stated in the accompanying text.

The second line of the first full paragraph from the top of page 6-119 should refer to “Impact 4.8-8” rather than “Impact 4.8-7”. This reference is parenthetical in nature and the conclusions are correctly stated in the same paragraph.